

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. VIII.

JANUARY 1904.

No. 1.

A BRIEF STATEMENT

OF THE

DOCTRINAL POSITION OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

By F. PIEPER.

In the Year of the Jubilee, 1897.

(Translated from the German by W. H. T. D.)

The doctrine taught and professed by our Synod has been repeatedly called *new*. Such has been the experience of the fathers and founders of our Synod, and such is still our own experience at the present time. However, our doctrine is not new, neither wholly, nor in part, but is as old as the Revelation of the Holy Scriptures. Our doctrine is none other than that which God has revealed in the writings of the apostles and prophets, and which the Lutheran church in her public Confessions professes from, and in accordance with, the Scriptures. This fact is attested by every sermon which is preached on Sundays from the pulpits of our congregations. It can also be observed in our periodicals and in other publications of our Synod. Still, it may not be improper, on the occasion of the semi-centennial of our Synod, to present on the following pages a brief statement of our faith and confession, embracing the leading points of doctrine, which we profess over against ancient and modern error.

2 A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINAL POSITION
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

We heartily believe that the Holy Scriptures are *the Word of God*, because the holy men of God, who wrote the Scriptures, did not write of their own accord, but only that which the Holy Ghost communicated to them by inspiration, as the Scriptures themselves expressly testify: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," 2 Tim. 3, 16; and again: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1, 21. Since the Holy Scriptures are, in all their words, the words of God, we furthermore profess that no errors or contradictions of any kind are found in them, but that they are throughout *infallible truth*, as our Lord Christ Himself testifies: "The Scriptures cannot be broken," John 10, 35. Finally, we also profess concerning these Holy Scriptures, which are the Word of God and infallible truth, that they are given by God to the Christian Church for a *foundation of faith*; for St. Paul says regarding the Christians, or the Christian Church, that they are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," Eph. 2, 20. The Scriptures are the *fountain* from which all doctrine proclaimed in the Church must be drawn; they are also the *infallible rule and norm*, by which all doctrines and teachers must be estimated and judged, according to the admonition of St. Peter: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," 1 Pet. 4, 11.

With our whole heart we reject the erroneous doctrine, which men seek to spread in the Christian Church of our day, *viz.*, that the Holy Scriptures are *not* purely the Word of God, but, in part, the Word of God, and, in part, also *the word of man*, and that, hence, they also contain errors, or, at least, are *capable* of containing them. We reject this erroneous doctrine as a very horrible one, because it contradicts Christ and the apostles to their faces, because it overthrows the foundation of faith, and because it sets up *men* as judges over the Word of *God*.

OF GOD.

We believe with all our hearts the sublime article of the *Holy Trinity*, *i. e.*, we believe, that there is *one* divine being, as Scripture testifies, *e. g.*, 1 Cor. 8, 4: "There is none other God but one." However, in this *one* divine being there are *three* distinct persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as is stated in the baptismal command: "Baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," Matt. 28, 19. These three persons are *distinct* from one another, *i. e.*, another person is the Father, another person is the Son, another person is the Holy Ghost; but these three persons are *equal in power, equal in eternity, equal in majesty*, because each person possesses the *one* divine essence *entire*, as St. Paul testifies concerning the Son of God: "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," Col. 2, 9.

We profess that human reason *cannot comprehend* how there can be *one* undivided divine essence and *three* distinct persons; but we believe this to be a fact, because *Holy Scripture* so testifies.

Accordingly, we reject the error of the New Protestants, and of all Unitarians, who will not believe except in *one* person of the Godhead, inasmuch as they teach, that only the *Father* is God, while they declare the *Son* to be a mere man, albeit endowed with special gifts, and the *Holy Ghost* to be a motion created in things, *e. g.*, the spirit of virtuousness, etc. Regarding these errorists we hold that they are *outside of the pale of the Christian Church*, and have no Gospel, no baptism, etc., as Scripture testifies, 1 John 2, 23: "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." In the second place, we also reject the error of old and new teachers who, while applying the name of God to the Son, still represent Him as being *inferior* to the Father according to His divine nature. Of these errorists we hold that they deny the *one* divine essence, and are striving to introduce pagan *polytheism* into Christianity.

OF CREATION.

We believe that God has created heaven and earth and all their host, and that *in the manner and in the time* recounted in the Holy Scriptures, especially Gen. 1 and 2, namely, by His almighty creative word, and in six days. We reject every doctrine by which the work of creation, as revealed in Scripture, is denied or limited, as is done, *e.g.*, when in our days it is assumed, ostensibly in deference to "science," that the world has, in immense periods of time, more or less developed out of itself.

OF SIN.

We believe that God created the first men according to His image, *i.e.*, in perfect righteousness and holiness, but that by the fall of the first men not only they themselves, but also all their natural offspring, have come under the wrath of God, and have lost their original righteousness and holiness. Accordingly, we believe that after the fall of the first men all men are sinners already *by birth*, *i.e.*, that they enter this world with a nature wholly corrupt by sin, void of all fear of God, but having the lust of every sin dwelling in them, as Scripture testifies, Gen. 8, 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." We also believe, despite all contradiction of blind human reason, that this inborn sin, or original sin, is *truly sin*, *i.e.*, that it subjects men to the wrath of God and to eternal damnation, as Scripture again testifies Eph. 2, 3: "We were by nature the children of wrath." Finally, we also believe that all men do not rise above their sinful nature, not even by the "progress and culture" of our times, but with all their efforts they *remain*, on their part, *sinners* in the sight of God, subject to the wrath of God and to eternal damnation, as it is written: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," John 3, 6. And again, Rom. 8, 7, 8: "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to

the Law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God."

We reject all doctrines which come into conflict with the doctrine here professed, to-wit, firstly, the error of all ancient and modern errorists, who imagine that man's in-born evil condition is not accounted sin by God, and who, accordingly, also imagine that infants are not in need of the remission of sins and of baptism. We reject, secondly, the false doctrine that man is by nature good, or only partially corrupt, and that, hence, by doing all in his power he can obtain grace from God, or render himself a somewhat worthy recipient of the same. All these errors we reject, because they contradict Scripture, because they deceive men regarding their condition, and because they are a reproach to Christ, who by *His* fulfillment of the Law and by *His* suffering and death has redeemed men from sin, from the wrath of God, and from eternal damnation.

OF REDEMPTION.

We believe that the second person of the Godhead, *i. e.*, the Son of God, *was made man*, and this in the following manner, *viz.*, that in the fullness of time He received into His divine person a true human nature from the Virgin Mary by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Accordingly, we believe, regarding Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, that He is "true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary," *true God and true man in one undivided and indivisible person*. This miracle of the incarnation of the Son of God has taken place to the end that He should become the Mediator between God and man, namely, that *in the place of mankind* He should fulfill the Law, suffer and die, and thus reconcile all mankind with God, and bring them again unto life. All of which is testified by the Holy Ghost through St. Paul, who says: "When the fullness of

the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons," Gal. 4, 4. 5.

We reject all errors opposed to this truth. In particular, we repudiate the gross error of certain modern teachers who are not afraid to reiterate the blasphemy of ancient enemies of the Christian Church, to the effect, that Christ was not born of the Virgin Mary by the operation of the Holy Ghost, but that He is the natural son of Joseph. We also renounce the doctrine of the New Protestants, and of all Unitarians, who regard Christ as a mere man, and who represent salvation to consist in this, that Christ has by His virtuous life shown men how *by their own virtue* they might attain to heaven. We, furthermore, renounce all errors by which the person and the work of Christ are *divided*, as is done, *e. g.*, by the teaching, that it was the human nature alone, and not the Son of God, which truly suffered, or by the assertion, that after His ascension Christ is present with His Church on earth only according to His divine, but not according to His human nature. On the contrary, we maintain this comforting Scripture ground, that the Son of God, in and with His adopted human nature, did truly suffer for the liquidation of the sins of the whole world, inasmuch as Scripture testifies that *the Lord of glory* has been crucified, 1 Cor. 2, 8, and that the blood of Jesus Christ, *the Son of God*, cleanses us from all sin, 1 John 1, 8. We also believe that Christ, after His exaltation to the right hand of God, can be, and in reality is, present here on earth, not only according to His divine nature, but also according to His human nature, according to which He is our brother, as Scripture testifies: "He ascended up far above all heavens, *that He might fill all things*," Eph. 4, 10, and as Christ Himself, prior to His ascension, has promised: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," Matt. 28, 20.

OF FAITH IN CHRIST.

Since Christ by His vicarious life, suffering, and death is the *sole* Redeemer of men, and since God has the salvation, which was wrought out by Christ, proclaimed to men through the Gospel, to the end that they may *believe* this salvation, and thus become sharers therein, we profess that *faith in Christ* is the only way for men to obtain salvation, as Christ Himself testifies: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him," John 3, 36.

However, by faith in Christ we understand faith in *the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake*, *i. e.*, this confidence of the heart, that God by grace, for Christ's sake, without our works, forgives all our sins, and receives us to everlasting life. We reject the doctrine, which in our time is widely disseminated, especially among the sects in our country, and according to which faith in Christ is not understood to be faith in the *Gospel*, *i. e.*, in the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, but human efforts to fulfill the *Law* of God.

OF CONVERSION.

Faith in Christ, by which alone men are saved, is not by nature found in man, but is wrought in man by conversion.

Regarding conversion, we believe that it is neither wholly, nor one half, nor one thousandth part, the work of man, but *the work of God alone*, who by grace for Christ's sake works the same in man by His Word. We believe thus, because it is the plain doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. Scripture, namely, states, in the first place, regarding unconverted man, that he is *dead* in sins, Eph. 2, 1, and that he does not advance toward salvation in Christ, but regards it as foolishness, 1 Cor. 2, 14. In the second place, Scripture *explicitly* declares conversion to be the work of God alone, yea, to be an operation of divine omnipotence. Eph. 2, 4, 5: "*God*, who is rich in mercy, for His great love

wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." Eph. 1, 19. 20: "We believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead."

We, furthermore, profess that the Holy Spirit is willing to work conversion not only in a few, but *in all hearers* of the Word, and that, if a part of the hearers, nevertheless, remain unconverted, this is due not to a deficiency in the grace of God, but must be ascribed solely to the obstinate resistance of man, as Christ says of unbelieving Jerusalem: "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not," Matt. 23, 37, and as Stephen says of the unbelieving Jews: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye," Acts 7, 51. Grace, although it is seriously intended, yea, although it is an almighty grace, Eph. 1, 19. 20, can nevertheless be resisted on the part of man. Man cannot *promote* his conversion, but he can *hinder* it.

Since the question has been frequently raised in the Christian Church, especially in our day, *What is the cause* why not all men are converted, seeing that the grace of God is universal, and that all men are alike found in a state of utter depravity? we profess that on Scriptural ground we know only this much, that it is due to the grace of God, and to it alone, if men are *converted*, while it is due to men, and to them alone, and is not due to a defect in grace, if men are *not converted*, as is written Hos. 13, 9: "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in *me* is thine help." Here we rest the matter, since Scripture has revealed nothing further.

We reject with all our heart every kind of *synergism*, *i. e.*, every doctrine which teaches that conversion is not wrought by the grace of God alone, but in part, or "in a

certain respect," also by man himself, or that it is effected by man's good "conduct." We reject this doctrine, because it contradicts Scripture, because it makes man, in part at least, his own Savior, and because it thus overthrows the chief article of our religion which teaches that we are saved by grace alone for Christ's sake.—We also reject every kind of *Calvinism*, *i. e.*, every doctrine which teaches that God would seriously convert *not all hearers of the Word*, but only a part of them. We reject this doctrine, because it also contradicts Scripture, and leads to despair.—Accordingly, we reject both the Calvinistic answer to the question why not all men are converted, *viz.*, that the grace of God is not universal nor seriously intended; and the synergistic answer to the same question, *viz.*, that conversion and salvation do not solely depend on the grace of God, but also on the good conduct of man. We reject both answers, because they contradict Scripture. In answering questions we do not proceed further than Scripture leads us, and Scripture teaches that whoever is converted is converted solely by the grace of God, and whoever remains unconverted must ascribe this fact to the resistance which he has offered to the gracious operations of the Holy Ghost.

OF JUSTIFICATION.

All its teachings regarding the love of God to a sinner-world, regarding the salvation wrought out by Christ, regarding the insufficiency of all men to acquire salvation through themselves, and regarding faith in Christ as the only way to obtain salvation, the Scripture sums up in the article of *justification*, by which it teaches the reason why, and the manner in which, a person is accounted righteous before God, and received unto eternal life. Holy Scripture, namely, teaches that God does not receive men on a basis of their own work and their own merit, as the blind world and nominal Christians imagine Him to do, but that without

the deeds of the Law, alone by grace, on account of the perfect merit of Christ, He justifies them, *i. e.*, He *regards* as righteous all those who *believe* in Christ, *i. e.*, who *believe* on the authority of the Gospel, *that for Christ's sake their sins are forgiven them*. Thus the Holy Spirit testifies through St. Paul: "There is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," Rom. 3, 22—24. And again: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law," Rom. 3, 28.

This doctrine we believe with all our heart, and pray God to graciously preserve us and our posterity in the same. For only by this doctrine Christ is given the *honor* due Him, *viz.*, that by His life, suffering, and death He is our only Redeemer, and only by this doctrine poor sinners receive this abiding *comfort*, that God is assuredly gracious to them. Regarding this doctrine we hold, in harmony with our fathers, that it is "the *principal article* of the Christian doctrine;" this doctrine is the real secret of Scripture, by which Scripture is distinguished from all false books of religion; for only Scripture teaches this article, that men are saved by faith in Christ crucified, and not by their own works. We also profess that only where *this* article has entered into a heart by faith there are Christians, and there is the Christian Church found, while all men who do not believe this article must be numbered with the unbelieving, even though they are found in external communion with the Church.

Accordingly, we also profess that the Christians of all times must exercise holy zeal and the greatest care to have this article taught *with perfect purity*, *i. e.*, to have *all works of men*, by whatever name they may be called, excluded from the same. We do not only reject the well-known gross error of the merit of works, which the sect of the Papists teaches, and the equally gross error, which cer-

tain so-called Protestants teach, who state that God receives a person unto grace if he strives after virtue, as far as he is able; but we also reject all modern doctrines, by which the *renewal* and *sanctification* of men, designated as "ethical conception of faith," or "inwardness of the Christian belief," is made a cause of justification alongside of the grace of God and the merit of Christ. For, while it is true that faith, whenever it enters a heart, effects also an inward renewal and sanctification, and brings forth good morals and good works, still it is not through these features that faith *justifies* in the sight of God, but *solely through the act of believing and accepting the merit of Christ from the Word of the Gospel*.

Finally, we declare that by every kind of synergism, *i. e.*, that by every doctrine which ascribes to man a co-operation unto conversion or unto the acquisition of faith, the article of justification is corrupted. For even if people rightly say, in harmony with the Church, that man is justified without works "by faith," or even "by faith alone," still by their false doctrine of conversion they have made faith itself, in part, a work of man, and thus they have again introduced man's work into the article of justification.

We reject as *fundamental corruptions of the Christian faith* all heresies by which man's own works, and his own merit, is mingled into the article of justification. For the Christian faith is none other than this, that we obtain the forgiveness of sins and salvation, without our works, alone by grace for Christ's sake, through faith.

OF GOOD WORKS.

Regarding good works we hold that only those works are good which a person performs *to the end of serving and honoring God* according to the rule of the divine Law. The statement not unfrequently heard among Christians of our day, that the *motive* from which a work is performed might be left out of the account, if only the work itself is performed,—this statement we regard as heathenish blindness.

Such works, however, as are performed *in the service and honor of God* no man performs unless he *first believes* that God has received him to eternal life by grace for Christ's sake, without all works of his own, as is written: "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin," Rom. 14, 2. Accordingly, we reject as a great folly the modern assertion, that among Christians works must be *placed in the fore*, and faith must *step to the rear*. Good works *never precede* faith, but always *follow after*, and proceed from the same.

Regarding all works which are performed with a view *to first acquire* the grace of God and salvation, we declare, that they bring upon the doers thereof not the grace of God and salvation, but the wrath of God and eternal damnation, as is written Gal. 3, 10: "As many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse." However, all works which *follow after* and *proceed from* faith, *i. e.*, which flow from gratitude on account of the grace which a person has experienced in Christ, while they do not merit salvation, still are crowned by God in the life everlasting with a glorious *reward of grace*, as St. Paul testifies 2 Cor. 9, 6: "He which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." Accordingly, we hold that there is a constant necessity among Christians of diligent admonition to good works, by reminding them of the mercy of God in Christ, after the example of St. Paul, Rom. 12, 1: "I beseech you, brethren, *by the mercies of God*, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." However, we reject as unchristian and foolish all attempts at producing good works by the threats and the compulsion of the Law, or by carnal motives.

Since, also, in our time the notion prevails, not only among Papists, but also among Protestants, that a person can serve God by *self-elected* works, *i. e.*, by works which God has not commanded, such as forbidden meats, and ordinances pertaining to the Sabbath, we profess, that, in the same manner as all works must flow from faith in Christ,

so they must also be performed according to the rule of the divine command. With Luther we call that a truly holy life when Christians *believingly* perform the works of their common Christian calling, such as patience under the cross, forgiving one's enemies, etc., and the works of the special estates ordained by God for this present life, such as the works of parents, children, servants, teachers, rulers, and subjects.

OF THE MEANS OF GRACE.

Although the whole earth is full of the temporal bounties and blessings of God, and although God is *present* and *operates* everywhere throughout creation, as is written: "By Him all things consist," Col. 1, 17, and: "In Him we live, and move, and have our being," Acts 17, 28, still we believe that God does not offer and communicate the *spiritual blessings* purchased by Christ, such as the forgiveness of sins, the Holy Spirit, etc., except through *the means of grace* ordained by Him.

These means of grace are the Word of the Gospel, and the sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper. The Gospel, according to the Scriptures, is the word of the *grace of God*, Acts 20, 24. 32; it *ministereth the Spirit*, Gal. 3, 5; Baptism is applied "*for the remission of sins*," Acts 2, 38, and is the *washing of regeneration*, Tit. 3, 5; and that the object of the Lord's Supper, *i. e.*, of the ministration of the body and blood of Christ, can be none other than the communication and sealing of *the forgiveness of sins*, is testified by these words: "*Given for you*," and, "*Shed for you*," "*for the remission of sins*," Luke 22, 19. 20. Matt. 26, 28.

Accordingly, we profess, in the first place, that there is no other way for the Church to gain souls, and to preserve them in the Church, than *the use of the means of grace ordained by God*. All *other* means for building the Church, *i. e.*, all means which do not consist in, nor conduce to, the use of the Word of God, we reject as "*new*

measures,' by which the Church is not built, but harmed. Accordingly, we profess, in the second place, that all men who by the Law have come to a knowledge of their sins, and are inquiring how they may obtain grace, and become certain of the same, *must be directed to the Gospel and the Sacraments*. For by these means of grace, not by the Law, or by the sensations of their hearts, etc., all men can and shall know, and that *infallibly*, how God in His heart regards them, namely, that for Christ's sake He is gracious to them, and willing to forgive their sins. For as Christ has obtained grace for all men without distinction, so He likewise offers the grace obtained by Him to all men without distinction through the means of grace appointed by Him, and bids them accept the proffered grace by faith, which faith He purposed to enkindle and to strengthen in them through these selfsame means of grace.

We reject the doctrine of the sects, that the grace and Spirit of God are communicated not *by means of* the Word and Sacraments, but by an *immediate* and secret operation. By this erroneous doctrine faith is robbed of its God-given foundation, and degenerates into enthusiasm; at the same time grace itself is denied and rendered uncertain. We also reject the doctrine of the Papists, that the mere outward use of the means of grace *without faith* makes a person a partaker of grace. For as earnestly as we hold that grace is conveyed and offered to all men who use the means of grace, so earnestly we also hold that only those become partakers of grace who *believe*, as the words and promises declare. We also know that by the methods both of enthusiasts and of Romanists the cardinal doctrine of the Christian religion is denied, *viz.*, that we are saved by grace for Christ's sake, and not by our own works. For a person who refuses to believably receive the forgiveness of sins out of the word of the Gospel and out of the Sacraments is seeking it in himself, and purposed to base it upon his renewal and sanctification, that is, upon his own worthiness, hence,

not upon the merit of Christ alone. Again, a person who imagines that he is become a child of God by the mere external use of the means of grace, without faith, puts his trust not in the merit of Christ, but in the works pertaining to his external relation with the Church.

We profess that all means of grace convey *the same* grace, and that they convey it *entire*. The Word of the Gospel gives the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation; the same is done by Holy Baptism and by the Holy Supper, as is shown by the passages of Scripture cited above. The difference is only this, that the forgiveness of sins, which is fully and entirely given already by the Word of the Gospel, is appropriated and sealed *severally to individuals* for a great comfort of their consciences, in Baptism "with the washing of water by the Word," and in the Holy Supper by the wonderful gift of the body and blood of Christ. The question: "Why must the same grace be offered and sealed in *several ways?*" we answer from our Confessions, with gratitude towards God, as follows: "The Gospel affords us more than one means, one counsel and assistance, in opposition to sin; *for God is superabundantly rich in His grace.*"

In addition, we profess, as regards Baptism in particular, that it is right to *baptize also infants*, because Christ has commanded little children to be brought to Him, Mark 10, 14, and St. Paul teaches, Col. 2, 11. 12, that Baptism in the New Testament has taken the place of circumcision in the Old Testament; and, finally, because in His *general* command of baptism, Matt. 28, 19, Christ does not expressly except children, hence, includes them. We also believe that by Baptism, which is a washing of regeneration, Tit. 3, 5, children obtain faith, and through faith receive in Baptism forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.

We reject the delusion of the Baptists, who teach that children must not be baptized, and who also contend that children are not capable of faith, contrary to the words of

Christ, who expressly affirms of children, that they have *faith*, Matt. 18, 6, and that theirs is the fruit of faith, the *kingdom of heaven*, Mark 10, 14.

OF THE ELECTION OF GRACE.

We heartily believe that there is an *election of grace*, or an *election to life everlasting*. Holy Writ reveals that all those who for Christ's sake, by the grace of God, through the means of grace, obtain faith, are justified, sanctified, and preserved in faith *here in time*,—that all these have already had these spiritual blessings accorded them by God *from eternity*, and this for the same reason, and in the same manner, namely, by grace alone for Christ's sake, and according to the order of the means of grace. For thus Scripture testifies, Eph. 1, 3—5: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: *according as He hath chosen us in Him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself." And again, Acts 13, 48: "And as many as were ordained unto eternal life believed." And again, Rom. 8, 29, 30: "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son. . . . Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified."

Accordingly, we reject, as an erroneous doctrine hostile to Scripture, the teaching, that not the grace of God alone and the merit of Christ are the cause of the election of grace, but that God has found, or seen, also *in us* something good which prompted or caused Him to elect us, no matter whether this merit be called "*good works*," "*good conduct*," or by any other name. For thus the Holy Spirit testifies through St. Paul, 2 Tim. 1, 9: "God hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, *not according to our*

works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

Nor does Holy Scripture teach that God has in election regarded the *faith* of the elect, or that He has elected "in view of faith," in such a manner, that the faith of the elect was already in them *before* their election, but according to Scripture faith belongs to the spiritual blessings which God has accorded us by His eternal election. Thus Scripture teaches, Acts 13, 48: "And as many as were ordained unto eternal life believed," and thus the Confession of our church on Scriptural ground testifies concerning the eternal election of God: "Through His gracious will and good pleasure in Christ Jesus it is also a *cause* which procures, works, facilitates, and promotes our salvation and whatever pertains to it; and upon this our salvation is so firmly grounded that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' Matt. 16, 18. For it is written: 'Neither shall any pluck my sheep out of my hand,' John 10, 28. And again, Acts 13, 48: '*And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.*'"

As earnestly as we maintain that there is an election of *grace*, or a predestination to *salvation*, so decidedly we teach, on the other hand, that there is no election of *wrath*, or, which amounts to the same, a predestination to *damnation*. As God's love to a sinner-world is universal, and as Christ has perfectly redeemed all men, so God is willing to bring all men without distinction unto faith, to preserve them therein, and thus to save them; as Scripture testifies, 1 Tim. 2, 4: "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." No man is lost because God had predestinated him to eternal damnation, but only those are lost who judge themselves unworthy of everlasting life, *i. e.*, who put the Word of the Gospel from them, and obstinately resist the earnest operation of the Holy Spirit.

We reject every doctrine which teaches that God does not earnestly desire all men to be saved, but has

from the beginning created a part of them to damnation, or that He passes some men by with His converting grace. We also reject the distinction that is made between a *weak* universal grace and a *strong* converting grace, the former of which is said to refer to all men, while the latter is said to refer only to the elect; on the contrary, we hold that the grace which is accorded those who are lost is, as regards its virtue and intention, a converting grace, Acts 13, 46; 7, 51. Matt. 23, 37.

OF THE CHURCH.

We believe one holy Christian Church on earth, the one Head of which is Christ, and which is gathered, preserved, and governed by Christ through His Word.

The members of this Church are those men, and only those men, who by the operation of the Holy Ghost believe in Christ, i. e., who believe that God has forgiven their sins for Christ's sake. Or to express it more briefly, the Christians are the Church. It is self-evident that outside of this Church, which is the aggregate of the believers, there is *no salvation*, because Christ says: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him." It is equally self-evident that this Church is, to men, *invisible*, because the faith of the heart, which alone makes a person a member of the Church, can be seen only by God, the Searcher of hearts, as is written: "The Lord knoweth them that are His," 2 Tim. 2, 19.

Regarding this Church, which is the communion of all believers, and outside of which there is no salvation, we hold that it is found not only in those external church communities which rightly and purely teach the Gospel *in every part*, but also in such organizations where, alongside with error, so much of the Gospel is still preserved as to enable souls to obtain faith. Accordingly, we reject the teaching, that only in the orthodox Lutheran church chil-

dren of God are found; on the contrary, we profess that the Church exists throughout the whole world in all places where there are *believing souls*, which may also be the case in places where errorists have obtained the rule, as God says concerning Israel, at a time when the priests of Baal were ruling: "I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal," 1 Kings 19, 18.

Although, by the great mercy of God, there are found children of God also in the church communities of errorists, still such church organizations of errorists do not exist by the will of God, but are earnestly *prohibited*, since God desires to have His Word, in every particular, both preached and believed with purity, as is written 1 Pet. 4, 11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." Hence, it is the will of God, that Christians should affiliate only with orthodox church organizations, and that Christians who have strayed into heterodox church organizations should *leave* the same, and seek the communion of the orthodox Church, as is written Rom. 16, 17: "I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and *avoid them.*" Accordingly, we reject the *unionistic practice* prevalent especially in our time, that is, the rather unchurchly practice of churches, which make it a duty of Christians not to separate from false teachers, but to *remain* with them. We reject unionism as disobedience to the express command of Christ, as the real cause of the origin and continuance of divisions in the Church, and as a standing danger, threatening the *entire* loss of the Word of God.

Since, curiously enough, there has been, and still is, a controversy in the Church as to *who possesses* the spiritual power which Christ has given to His Church on earth, such as the power to call and to send out preachers, to excommunicate impenitent sinners, to absolve the penitent, to order affairs in the Church which Christ has not commanded, etc., we profess that all spiritual power which

Christ has given to His Church is held by those who are the Church, namely, by the *Christians*, or the *believers*. For just as the believers are justified and become the children of God by faith, just so do they possess, by the same faith, all spiritual blessings and rights which Christ has purchased for His Church. Of this fact St. Paul reminds the believers, saying: "All things are yours," 1 Cor. 3, 21., and thus Christ Himself appropriates *to all believers* the keys of the kingdom of heaven, Matt. 16, 13—19; 18, 17—20. John 20, 22. 23, and commissions *all believers* to preach the Gospel, Matt. 28, 19. 20. Accordingly, we reject all doctrines by which this spiritual power, or any part thereof, is ascribed as belonging *originally* to individual persons, such as the Pope, or the bishops, or to the order of the ministry, or to secular princes, or to councils and synods, etc. We also believe that Christians should with great diligence guard their spiritual rights, chiefly for this reason, that they may not become the servants of men, but may acknowledge Christ alone as their Lord, 1 Cor. 7, 23, and furthermore for this reason, that they may not be slothful in the discharge of their spiritual duties which are connected with their spiritual rights.

Inasmuch as also this question has been controverted, *how many Christians*, or *what part* of the Church possessed the spiritual power described above, we profess that a congregation at *any place*, or, any *local* congregation, has all spiritual power; for it is the local congregation which our Lord Christ in Matt. 18, 17. 18 names as the congregation, or church, in which He has vested the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and, hence, all spiritual power, saying: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." We also observe in the New Testament that in the apostolic Church *local congregations*, prompted by the apostles, elect pastors, Acts 14, 23, and other officers of the Church, Acts 6, 5, also that they are ordered to exclude impenitent sinners, 1 Cor. 5, 13, and to

absolve the penitent, 2 Cor. 2, 6 ff., to inspect the proper administration of the ministerial office, Col. 4, 17, etc. Accordingly, we reject all doctrines by which the power of the Church is conceded only to the church of an entire country, or to an entire synod, or even to the Church universal only, and by which, consequently, the *subjection by divine right* of a local congregation to a greater church organization is taught. This is no small error, but it is the antichristian error upon which popery has been founded. Over against this error we maintain that all greater church organizations, such as synods, churches embracing an entire country, councils, etc., only sustain the relation of *advisers* to the local congregation, and have only so much power as the local congregation has conferred upon them. We also profess, that, while the union of local congregations into *synods*, or other church organizations of greater dimensions, is a highly beneficial institution, still it is not commanded by God, but is an *institution of the Church*. For as the office of the ministry is the only *divinely appointed* office within the Church, so the congregation, which at any place gathers around this office of the ministry, is the only external community of *divine appointment*. All other offices and external unions within the Church are not of divine appointment, but are ordinances of the Church, and must be so ordered and conducted as to be *subservient* to the office of public preaching and to the local congregation. Accordingly, we also reject and combat every kind of "church societies" in our day by which the congregational bonds which God has ordained are dissolved, or the activity of the congregation is hindered, and we approve and aid only such societies as become subordinate and subservient to the congregation.

OF THE MINISTRY.

Regarding the office of the ministry we teach that it is a *divine ordinance*, *i. e.*, the Christians at a certain place are enjoined by divine precept to put to use the Word of

God not only privately and within the circle of their families, but it is their duty also to have the Word preached among them *publicly* by persons qualified for such work, and to have the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, Matt. 28, 18—20. Acts 14, 23. 2 Tim. 2, 3.

However, the office of the ministry possesses no other power than the power of *the Word*, 1 Pet. 4, 11, *i. e.*, it is the duty of Christians to yield an unconditional obedience to the office of the ministry, whenever and wherever the minister proclaims to them the Word of God, Hebr. 13, 17. Luke 10, 16; on the other hand, if the minister in his teachings and injunctions goes beyond the Word of God, it would not be the duty of Christians to obey, but to disobey him, so as to remain faithful to Christ, in accordance with the word of Christ: "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," Matt. 23, 8. Accordingly, we reject with all our heart the erroneous doctrine by which the office of the ministry is given the power to impose a yoke upon the neck of the disciples in matters which Christ has not commanded.

We also profess that the right *to judge in matters of doctrine* does not only belong to pastors, synods, councils, etc., but to all believers, because all believers are commanded to avoid false teachers, a warning which Christ inculcates on all children of God, saying: "Beware of false prophets," Matt. 7, 15. Any person who infringes the right of Christians to judge in matters of doctrine gives the Christians over into the power of men, and makes them subject, as regards their faith, to men, instead of subjecting them to God alone. From the right, however, of Christians to decide doctrinal matters results the *duty* to diligently study the Word of God, so as to be able to discharge this important office. For they are to decide doctrines not according to their own notions, but according to what is written. Christians *shall* and *may* decide doctrine *in accordance with the Word of God*.

OF THE MILLENNIUM.

We believe that the Church of God here on earth will unto the last day *be subject to the cross*, and the more so the nearer the last day approaches, as the Holy Ghost by St. Paul testifies to all Christians, that they must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God, Acts 14, 22. We reject the doctrine, that the Church may expect here on earth a future glorious estate in a reign of a thousand years, because this doctrine contradicts clear passages of Scripture, and misleads Christians to direct their hope to an imaginary happiness here on earth, instead of directing it alone to the happiness in heaven.

OF THE ANTICHRIST.

As regards *the great Antichrist*, we do not believe that he is yet to come, but hold that he has appeared in the Roman Papacy, because the abominations which have been predicted in Scripture, especially in 2 Thess. 2, regarding the Antichrist agree with the kingdom of the Pope and his members. For we behold the Pope, under the name and title of an infallible Vicegerent of Christ on earth, continually leading men away from the *Word* and *merit* of Christ, and, instead thereof, leading them to his own papal word and to the righteousness of human works, and, hence, hurrying them into eternal damnation; and we behold him doing all this *under the enticing appearance of external church forms and great sanctity* and appealing to all manner of lying powers, signs, and wonders. Accordingly, we recognize in Popery that greatest enemy of the Christian Church predicted in 2 Thess. 2, and we hold that those err, and cannot rightly warn souls against the seducing power of Popery, who expect the great Antichrist, or the full manifestation thereof, to be an event of the future.

OF CHURCH AND STATE.

Although both Church and State are ordinances of *God*, they must not be mingled into one another. Church and State have entirely different *aims*. By the Church God purposes to *save* men, whence the Church is called the "mother" of believers, Gal. 4, 26. By the State God purposes to maintain *external order* among men, "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," 1 Tim. 2, 2. In like manner, the *means* which Church and State employ to gain their ends are entirely different. The Church may not employ any other means than *the preaching of the Word of God*; she detests, in particular, all external force and coercion, in accordance with the saying of Christ to Peter, when the latter had drawn the sword: "Put up thy sword into the sheath," John 18, 11, and to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence," John 18, 36. On the other hand, the State makes laws bearing on civil life, and rightly employs for their execution also *the sword and other corporal punishments*, as is written Rom. 13, 4: "He," *i. e.*, the government, "beareth not the sword in vain."

Accordingly, we reject with all our heart the practice of those who desire to see the power of the State employed "in the interest of the Church," and who thus make the Church a secular kingdom, to the great detriment of the Church. We likewise reject the foolish attempts of those who would make the State a church, by striving to govern the State by the Word of God, instead of ruling it by external, civil laws, when it is known that only Christians can be governed by the Word of God.

WAS JEHOVAH IN PREPROPHETIC TIMES A NATIONAL DEITY?

It is regarded as an axiom by the "advanced thinkers" of our times that all things must have a common origin. Where, in past ages, discord and diversity were supposed to reign the light of modern research is said to reveal harmony and affinity. Not satisfied, therefore, with observing facts and phenomena and drawing inferences therefrom, men start quite at the other end of the line and propound theories which shall reduce all data to a common level and bring them into coordination. An ingenious hypothesis or a happy conjecture possesses far more fascination than induction from cold, established facts. Consequently, astronomers educe the whole material universe from the alleged primeval fire-mist that once whirled through the gulfs of space; naturalists put forth theories on the "origin of species," while comparative philologists are no longer content with comparing and contrasting various languages and systems of grammar, but consider it their task to "speculate on the origin of language itself." In other words, the theory of development or evolution is accepted and applied as the one supreme law in the realms of matter and mind. And it is invested with such despotic authority that whatever contravenes it is summarily set aside. The theory is pushed through on all hands, though the very stones should rise and mutiny.

Nor has the domain of religion escaped. The law of evolution is declared to underlie the religious history of mankind. All religious phenomena, it is assumed, are only the outward manifestations of man's inherent religious instincts, just as art is the concrete embodiment of his innate ideas of beauty. According to the advocates of religious evolution, man did not receive so much as a mustard seed of religion to start with, but worked out the whole problem unassisted and single-handed. Naturally, his first attempts

were crude and rudimentary in the extreme. But by a series of regularly graduated upward movements he finally reached that exalted position now occupied by the enlightened nations of Christianity. No gaps, or leaps, or miraculous interventions are allowed in the unfolding of the process. From the first rude beginnings, when the savage paid homage to his museum of fetishes, to the lofty faith of the Christian who worships God in spirit and in truth there is no break in the chain of development. And while some, indeed, hold that Christianity is the goal and culmination of the entire evolutionary scheme, others, more hopeful and more consistent, look forward to the time when Christianity, in its turn, shall become obsolete and be replaced by something still higher.¹⁾

Hence in modern works on comparative religion we find such statements as these:—“The foremost writers on the science of religion . . . attempt to show that the religions of the world have a vital connection with each other and are manifestations in different ways of the same spirit.”²⁾ “There is no break in the development from the hooked stick to the steam plough. And should it not be the same in religion?” “If we regard religions as stages in the evolution of religion . . . we shall not divide religions into the true one, Christianity, and the false ones, all the rest; no religion will be to us a mere superstition, nor shall we regard any as unguided by God.”³⁾

In view of this all-leveling syncretizing tendency, it is not surprising that those who believe in the unique and distinctive character of the theology (in the narrower sense) of the Old Testament should find themselves compelled to antagonize such positions as the one involved by the ques-

1) According to Auguste Comte, the religion of man began with *fetichism*, proceeded thence to *polytheism*, and finally reached *monotheism*. But while Tiele and his school regard monotheism as a permanent religion, the French philosopher held that it was destined to be supplanted by positive philosophy. Cf. Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, vol. II, note III.

2) Menzies, *History of Religion*, p. 4.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 5.

tion which heads this article. The fact is that the radical criticism seeks to eliminate the most characteristic feature in Israel's religion, namely, that while the surrounding nations were wallowing in the mires of polytheism and superstition, the Hebrews worshiped the one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth. This is the "traditional" belief, and to any unprejudiced reader of the Old Testament this belief is represented by the books themselves. Nevertheless, to save the honor of the theory of religious evolution, it is maintained by the critics that the course of Israel's history moved along lines entirely different from, in fact, quite the reverse of, those exhibited by the Old Testament writings as we now have them. It is assumed at the outset that the religion of the Hebrews, at least in its initial stages, could not have been substantially different from that of their heathen neighbors. The seeming incongruity between the theory and the present documents is due, it is said, not to any fault in the theory, but to the manipulations, revisions, and redactional adjustments of later hands, when Israel had outgrown the age of religious childhood and put away childish things. In other words, pious (?) priests and redactors, who lived after the introduction of loftier conceptions respecting the deity, are supposed to have transferred these conceptions into the past, retouching, recasting, reconstructing, working over the earlier records and traditions, and systematically representing them in the purer light of their own age. And the critics furthermore contend that by a process of legitimate criticism and sifting they are still able to separate the earlier from the later elements of these writings, and thus to show from these documents themselves that, from the dawn of their history down to the age of the first canonical prophets, the religion of the Jews was essentially of a piece with that of the nations by whom they were surrounded.

According to the critical scheme, a number of wandering Hebrew tribes, "bound together by the memory of a

great national deliverance," came from the desert and found settlement in Canaan. They had their own national deity, Yahveh, who stood in the same relation to them as Chemosh to Moab or Milcom to Ammon. Menzies says that "he was probably a nature-god, and connected with storms and thunder, and had his seat at Mount Sinai." This Yahveh, then, was Israel's god, and *Israel was his people*, and that in an entirely different sense from that traditionally associated with the phrase. Says Robertson Smith: "The god can no more exist without his people than the nation without its god. The mass of the Israelites hardly seem to have risen above this conception. . . . Nay, it is plain that a great part of Israel imagined, like their heathen neighbors, that Jehovah had need of them as much as they had need of him."¹¹⁾ Though practically monotheists, they were theoretically polytheists. They did not deny the existence of other gods beside Yahveh, nor did they deem it an infringement upon his honor to incorporate many Canaanite elements into his worship, or to participate in the worship of Baal. These tribes had no idea of a universe, nor of a universal deity. For centuries they did not rise above a circumscribed national monolatry, and the fortunes of their god were linked together with those of his people.

At the foundation of the monarchy and the subsequent victories of David over Israel's foes, an advance was made in the Yahveh religion. Israel had been consolidated into a homogeneous people and was beginning to realize its strength. Not only was it conscious of a great past, but it looked forward to a still greater future. And Israel was Yahveh's people. His people had risen, and he rose with them. Henceforth he is a great god, who had chosen Israel as his people and who had made them great. He was mightier than the gods of the nations. Still, Yahveh had by no

1) *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 281 sq.

means attained to a position of absolute supremacy in the popular estimation. He might be the greatest among the gods, but other gods still existed. Another mighty impulse was needed finally to undo the heathen divinities and lift the Yahveh of Israel on the throne of absolute and undisputed godhead. And this impulse was given by the *prophets*.

The prophets, it must be remembered, are, according to the critical program, not reformers or restorers, but innovators and originators. They do not exhort their contemporaries to return to something they had left, but to embrace something new. They do not reproach them with apostasy from a purer form of worship, but urge them to abandon antiquated religious conceptions and practices in favor of a higher and broader faith. These "Semitic thinkers" (Menzies), the Platos and Socrateses of their age, have, by means of a theologically-political pragmatism, arrived at notions of the deity loftier and grander by far than those hitherto prevalent among their countrymen. Keenly observant of the political movements of their times, they foresee the terrible catastrophes about to burst upon the nation. They see the armies of foreign invaders overrunning and pillaging the fair land of Yahveh. The heathenish world power shall carry away its inhabitants, and the entire dissolution of the Israelitish community is imminent. How are those things to be accounted for? Was not Israel Yahveh's people? Indeed! Nor did the prophets attack this fundamental tenet of the popular belief. But while the masses thought it nothing short of blasphemy and iniquity on the part of the prophets in predicting ruin and disaster to Yahveh's people, the prophets themselves, taking a *moral* view of the situation, concluded that the clouds on the political horizon were the harbingers of Yahveh's wrath against the nation. In other words, Yahveh is about to punish his own people for their sins. Whereas in the popular view, Yahveh, who had no other people than Israel, was supposed to be bound to them and to display his power on their behalf even at the

expense of his holiness, the prophets insist that Yahveh is, above all, a God of righteousness who must assert the holiness of his character even at the expense of his own people. He is no longer a god whose fortunes are indissolubly linked together with those of his nation, but a dispenser of justice, irrespective of race or nationality. He can exist without Israel. Righteousness counts more with him than the prosperity of any people. Thus the important step is taken. A narrow particularism makes way for universalism. By making the ethical element paramount in Yahveh's character the prophets unconsciously unfit him for the role of a circumscribed national deity. He is the God of the whole earth, and rules the nations in the interests of righteousness. In this way, the god of Israel becomes God, while the gods of the nations fade away into "vanities" and airy nothings. Henceforth the fulfillment of his commands and the practice of mercy are the indispensable conditions of securing and enjoying his favor. Or, to use the critical phrase, the prophets are the inventors of "*ethic monotheism.*" Says Wellhausen: "Until their (the prophets') time the nation had sprung up out of the conception of Jehovah, now the conception of Jehovah was casting the nation into the shade. The natural bond between the two was severed, and the relation was henceforward viewed as conditional. As a God of righteousness, which is a law of the whole universe, Jehovah could be Israel's God only in so far as in Israel the right was recognized and followed. The ethical element destroyed the national character of the old religion." Such, then, in brief outline, is the theory respecting the evolution of the God of Israel. Before the age of the writing prophets, Yahveh is said to have been a mere local deity whose jurisdiction did not go beyond the borders of Palestine.

Let us now turn our attention to the arguments that are adduced in support of this position. As already observed, the critics maintain that a judicious separation of the early and late constituents of Old Testament documents

will result in a confirmation of their view.¹⁾ They insist that we do not marshal those elements against them which are obviously (in their opinion) the result of later redaction. For the sake of argument, therefore, let us, for the present, take for granted that these sagacious and sharp-eyed critics are perfectly able to detect and sunder out the original materials which, though overlaid by subsequent additions, are supposed to reveal the traces of the low and narrow conceptions of Yahveh's character prior to the prophetic movement.

An argument very much relied upon as establishing the theory that in preprophetic times Yahveh was not regarded as having exclusive possession of the field is the manner in which the name Baal was employed by the Israelites in the formation of proper names. Says Tiele: "Even so zealous representatives of Yahvism as Saul and David named their children after Baal."²⁾ This circumstance is supposed to show that the Israelites must have conceived of Baal in the same way as of Yahveh and accorded him a high place in their regard. Now it cannot be doubted that the Jews, like all Semitic nations, employed divine names in the formation of personal names. We have such names as Israel, compounded with El, or Jehoram or Isaiah into which the abbreviated form of Yahveh enters as an element. And more than this. We indeed find in the preprophetic period names in which the name of Baal, the Canaanite deity, forms a constituent, and that, too, as Robertson says, "among families most distinguished for their reverence to the God of the Hebrews."³⁾ In the list of Chronicles, we find a son of Saul named Eshbaal, 1 Chron. 8, 33, according to Robertson Smith "Man of Baal," according to Keil,

1) Of course, the principal reason why such a process of sifting becomes necessary is to maintain the theory of religious evolution. The critics approach the records with this theory ready made. It is the smoked glass through which they look.

2) *Compendium der Religionsgeschichte*, p. 353.

3) *Early Religion of Israel*, vol. I, p. 191.

“Fire of Baal,” *i. e.*, Destroyer of Baal (the latter is preferable). There is a son of David called Beeliada (1 Chron. 14, 7). There is even such a combination as Bealiah (Baal is Yah, *i. e.*, Yahveh), 1 Chron. 12, 5. Moreover, there is a famous passage in the Prophet Hosea which is thought to be decisive as indicating that before this time the Israelites of the Northern kingdom called their national god their Baal, and that this was a normal state of affairs. The passage runs: “And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi, and shalt no more call me Baali. For I will take away the names of the Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall be no more mentioned (remembered) by their name,” Hos. 2, 16. 17. On these verses Robertson Smith observes “that in Hosea’s time the use of the word (Baal) was felt to be dangerous to true religion; and indeed there can be no question that the mass of the people were apt to confound the true God with the false Baalim of Canaan, the local divinities or lords of individual tribes, towns, or sanctuaries.”¹⁾ To put it in a negative form, Smith would say, that before Hosea’s time no such danger was “*felt*” to exist, and that it was not thought wrong to apply the title of the Canaanite god to Yahveh. A new era is supposed to have begun with the prophets.

But this argument from the use of the name Baal is very precarious. It is to be observed, in the first place, that the word *baal* does not designate, in the first instance, the god of the Canaanites. It is primarily a common noun of the widest and most general application. It is employed to denote the husband of a wife, or the owner of an ox, or the inhabitants of a city, etc. It is, in fact, one of the commonest words in the Hebrew tongue, and there is no reason to assume that the Israelites first became acquainted with it after their settlement in Canaan. Manifestly, therefore, there could have been no impropriety in itself, if an Is-

1) *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 68.

raelite, being asked who his lord, his baal, was, would have answered that his baal (using the word in an appellative sense) was Yahveh. But by an obvious coincidence the Canaanites employed the same word as a proper noun, and applied it to their principal deity. And this circumstance was the occasion of mischief. As long as the Israelites were not infected with the idolatry of Canaan, they might use the word in the ordinary sense without giving honor to the pagan divinity. But we know that the children of Israel often apostatized and followed the baalim of Canaan. And thus it came that in times of such apostasy the mass of the people ceased to draw any sharp line of distinction between Yahveh and Baal, even going so far as to ascribe agricultural blessings to the goodness of the Canaanite gods, as pointed out by Hosea.

Bearing this in mind, the words of Hosea in the above-mentioned passage appear in a different light from that in which they are viewed by Robertson Smith. What the prophet means to say is not that the religion of Israel was now about to enter upon a higher stage of development, when Yahveh should no longer divide his empire with Baal as in former times; but, having charged them with idolatry and spiritual whoredom in the preceding section, Hosea goes on to say in the verses in question that the time is coming when Israel shall be cured of their inclination to serve other gods, when this religious amalgam shall cease, and the very name of Baal be shunned because of the idolatrous associations which it recalled. There is, therefore, no force in the argument that up to Hosea's time the Israelites placed their own Yahveh on the same, or nearly the same, level with Baal and other pagan divinities and that the prophet was trying, for the first time, to lift his people from this ancestral polytheism and syncretism to the recognition of one God. If David and Saul gave their children the names referred to, it was either because they used the word baal in an appellative sense with no thought of the

Canaanite Baal, or (if Baal was indeed in their minds) because they knew that an idol was nothing in the world. And this is probably the most natural explanation, since they were "zealous representatives of Yahvism." This argument is largely dependent, it appears, on the critics' own conception of what Yahvism means. To one who regards it as the worship of a national divinity it may seem irresistible; to another, who recognizes in Yahvism the worship of the one true God, it amounts to nothing. All depends ultimately on the critics' standpoint. And if there were cases when the name Baal, as denoting an actual deity, was used by the Israelites in forming proper names, this is no more than we should expect from a people that persistently lapsed into the idolatries of Canaan. The difference between us and the critics on this point is that, while they consider the whoring after the Baalim a normal state of things, we regard it as a defection from pure Yahvism. Besides, it is noteworthy that while "we find proper names compounded with the name Baal . . . we have no instances of a similar use of unequivocal proper names of heathen deities—such as Melkart, Eshmun, Astarte, etc.—which we should certainly expect if the Israelites were the polytheists they are made out to be. There is, in fact, no instance of any name of God being used to form proper names except the names that were applicable to their own God."¹⁾

The weakness of this argument will appear still further if we consider the ridiculous and absurd conclusions to which a similar mode of reasoning would lead us at the present day. It might be shown, for instance, that the inhabitants of the United States are still worshipers of the deities of German mythology, because the names of these deities are imbedded in the names of our days (Wednesday, Thursday, Friday); or that the belief of the Christian Church was largely permeated by a Judaistic leaven, because of the occurrence of such names as Daniel, Nathaniel,

1) Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, vol. I, p. 197.

Abraham, David, etc.; or that Apollos, the Alexandrian Jew, who was "mighty in the Scripture," was a devotee of the Greek god Apollo; or that the parents of Martin Luther must have retained a high veneration for the god Mars; or that such names as Phoebe or Irene, borne by Christian women, presupposed that Christendom had not yet fully emerged from the polytheism of Greece; or that "Isidore of Seville was a worshiper of the Egyptian Isis." In short, the very fact that recourse is had to this argument by the critics in the attempt to sustain their position only reveals the sandy foundation on which this position rests.

Another argument which is supposed to prove the circumscribed character of the prophetic Yahveh is grounded by the critics on such passages as seem to imply that Yahveh's power and dominion were restricted to the land of Israel. Robertson Smith points to the words of Ruth: "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God," as involving the notion that in the early days of Israel's history every god was confined to a particular nationality. Regarding the words of David, 1 Sam. 26, 19: "They have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go, serve other gods," the same critic observes that "to be banished from the land of Israel, the inheritance of Jehovah, is to be driven to serve other gods."¹⁾

But the matter is not quite so simple as it might appear at first sight. Apart from the fact that Ruth is a foreigner and speaks from a heathen standpoint, we must not insist too emphatically on pressing to the letter language which bears on its face the stamp of uncultured simplicity. What if the Moabitess had said to her mother-in-law, "I have, by a comparative critical study, reached the conviction that your religion is superior to mine. I am therefore determined to forsake the faith of my people and embrace the religion of the people of Yahveh. Pray do not turn me aside

1) *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 281.

from my purpose"—would the critics be satisfied with such language? But this is, in effect, what she does say; only she says it in her own homely, childlike way. Would you have this plain country-woman speak in the abstract language of a Leibnitz or a Locke? She is employing her own native, concrete style, and to press its literal words into the service of the theory is to betray an amazing lack of apprehension for the simplicities of unsophisticated speech.

Of the words of David in the passage cited above, it would, perhaps, be sufficient to say that they were uttered in the wilderness of Ziph, therefore within the bounds of Yahveh's own land. Whatever was the precise signification which David or other Israelites associated with the phrase, this much is certain that it had no such meaning as the modern critical school attaches to it. What David meant to say was probably that, being cut off from the services at Yahveh's sanctuary, he was treated no better than a pagan who was unentitled to participate in the worship of the one true God. This is all that can legitimately be evolved from the passage. It does not prove by any means that David thought to be banished from his own home and country would place him beyond the reach of Yahveh's help and power. That this is not blind dogmatism will appear from a consideration of other passages. In Deuteronomy, chap. 28, we find the following statements: "Yahveh shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which thou hast not known, and there shalt thou *serve other gods, wood and stone,*" v. 36. "Yahveh shall scatter thee among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; and there shalt thou *serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers, even wood and stone,*" v. 64. This is surely as strong an expression of the supposed belief that Yahveh's power ceased, if his worshipers went beyond the borders of Palestine, as the words of David. But hear the following verse of the same chapter: "And among these

nations shalt thou find no ease, and there shall be no rest for the sole of thy foot: but Yahveh will give thee a trembling heart and failing of eyes and pining of soul," etc., v. 65. In chap. 30 we find such words as these: "It shall come to pass when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call to mind . . . , that then Yahveh, thy God, will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee and will return and gather thee from all peoples, whither Yahveh, thy God, hath scattered thee." Here, then, we have the very same phrase which David employs—to be driven from the land of Yahveh "and serve other gods"—and that, too, in a writing which, according to the critics, was not in existence before the year 621, which originated, therefore, in an age when the supposed "ethic monotheism" of the prophets was in full bloom. And, combined with this phrase, there is the promise that Yahveh will hear the cry of His chastised people in their banishment and, in spite of other gods, restore them to their own country. Consequently, it is an unwarranted wresting of language to make this innocent expression of David serve the purpose for which it is employed by the critics.

We now come to consider the argument that the prophets, by investing Yahveh with a moral character, were the inventors of the so-called "ethic monotheism." We do not think that the critics give a satisfactory account of the rise of this "ethic monotheism." It was brought about, they say, by political events. Wellhausen states the case as follows: "Until the time of Amos there had subsisted in Palestine and Syria a number of petty kingdoms and nationalities, which had their friendships and enmities with one another, but paid no heed to anything outside their own immediate environment, and revolved each on its own axis, careless of the outside world, until suddenly the Assyrians burst in upon them. . . . They (the Assyrians) introduced a new factor, the conception of the

world—the world, of course, in the historical sense of that expression. In the presence of that conception, the petty nationalities lost their center of gravity, brute force dispelled their illusions, they flung their gods to the moles and bats. The prophets of Israel alone did not allow themselves to be taken by surprise; . . . they solved by anticipation the grim problem which history set before them. They absorbed into their religion that conception of the world which was destroying the religions of the nations, even before it had been fully grasped by the secular consciousness. Where others saw only ruin of everything that is holiest, they saw the triumph of Jehovah over delusion and error." Wonderful men, these prophets! How skillfully and cleverly they contrive to save the honor of the god of their little nationality instead of flinging him to the moles and bats! All the other petty nationalities lost their center of gravity when the world-conception began to dawn upon them in the presence of the Assyrian power, i.e., if they recognised the impotence of their gods when the Assyrians, under the patronage of their deities, were grinding them to powder, what we want to know is why the prophets of Israel alone retained their equilibrium and dexterously turned the confusion of other gods to the glory of their own. What enabled them to take such a unique view of the situation and cling to their faith in Yahweh, the deity of their petty nation, even though the nation itself be annihilated? Why should they, instead of losing their "center of gravity" in the face of the new conception, at once begin to declare that it was Yahweh, their own national deity, that was controlling all these forces, and straightway leap from a narrow monotheism to a world-wide monotheism? To these questions the theory we are considering gives no satisfactory answer. The prophets make the bold leap, but we are not told why, nor how they managed to clear the gulf. If we consult their own writings, we find the proper solution. It was because they had higher notions of Yahweh to start

with than the theory allows. It was not the political disasters that suggested to them a new center of gravity, but it was an old center of gravity, the belief in the sovereignty of Yahveh, that enabled them to keep their balance when "the Assyrians burst in upon them." In other words, the belief in the ethical character of Yahveh was not the result of prophetic reflection, but was inherited by the prophets from prophetic times.

Moreover, if this idea had its origin with the Assyrian invasion, we would naturally expect that it would be somewhat crude at its initial stage and be further developed and elaborated as time went on. But, like Athene from the head of Jupiter, it seems to have sprung full-grown from the head of the earliest prophets. Within the range of written prophecy we find no expansion or development in this "ethic monotheism" idea. Amos speaks of the all-controlling power of Yahveh in words which recall the majestic diction of the "Second Isaiah," Is. 40—66, the "great Unknown," who is supposed to have lived toward the close of the Babylonian captivity. But since we do not believe in this "great Unknown," we will say that Isaiah, hundred years before Jeremiah, celebrates the sovereign majesty of Yahveh with incomparably sublimer language than the later prophet. The critics insist on development in the conception of Yahveh, but they are powerless to read any development out of the writings of the prophets. In order to trace out a certain progress in the idea, some of them resort to the convenient practice of retouching a number of the noblest passages in the earlier prophets as interpolations. The critic thinks they "disturb the connection" or are "not suited to the context."

In the light of the preceding statements, therefore, it involves an utter misapprehension of the position of the prophets in the Jewish theocracy to regard them as revolutionaries storming at traditional beliefs and customs with the zeal of iconoclasts. The truth is that they were zealous

reformers who exhorted the nation to repentance. They invariably appeal to the conscience of their hearers, and nowhere give themselves the air of promulgating loftier ideals and conceptions in reference to the character of Yahveh. They remind Israel of its past history and the many favors it has already experienced at the hands of its faithful God; and on this foundation they base their warnings, rebukes, admonitions, and promises. When they denounce sacrifice (cf. Is. 1), it is not because, as the critics maintain, they have recognized that outward ceremonials are incompatible with the worship of a God whose character is essentially "ethical," but because sacrifice was offered in a cold, perfunctory way, without a pious disposition of the heart. What they denounce is the *opus operatum* theory of sacrifice, just as any preacher in our day must denounce the *opus operatum* theory of church-going.

A further argument supposed to uphold the theory we are antagonizing is drawn from the circumstance that the Biblical writers speak of the gods of the nations as if they ascribed to them a real existence. There can be no doubt that they speak of Chemosh as the god of Moab, Milcom (Moloch) as the god of Ammon, or Baalzebub as the god of Ekron. It is furthermore contended that even such expressions as the "God of the Hebrews," Ex. 3, 18, "Yahveh, the God of Israel," Judges 11, 21, involve the belief in the existence of other gods. We even find such a passage as, "Wilt thou not possess that which Chemosh, thy god, giveth thee to possess?" Judges 11, 24, which is thought to be decisive on the point under consideration. Nay, the very first commandment in the Decalogue, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," it is positively asserted, takes the existence of other gods for granted, though forbidding their worship by the Israelites. And the same notion is said to lie in the background of the question: "Who is like unto Thee among the gods?" in the Song of Moses, Ex. 15, 11. Again, in Ex. 12, 12 we have the ex-

pression: "For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and against the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment." Jethro says, Ex. 18, 11: "Now I know that Yahveh is greater than all gods." And many more passages of a similar character might be cited.

The contention is that the Old Testament writers regarded these deities as possessing actual existence and as endowed with divine attributes, enabling them to stand forth as the rivals of Yahveh. Such a position is, however, absolutely without foundation. True, they call these deities *elohim* (אֱלֹהִים, gods), as if they were indeed possessed of the powers of deity. But we must not overlook that these same writers call these selfsame deities *elilim*, or *habalim* (אֱלִילִים, הַבָּלִים, vanities, nothings, not-gods). As to their intrinsic nature and essence, these "gods" are "vanities" and phantoms, devoid of actual reality; but in the estimation of their worshipers they are real *elohim*, gods. Now, there can be no doubt that the writers of the Old Testament often spoke from the standpoint of the heathen themselves when referring to their deities. This is certainly the case in Judges 11, 24, which the critics triumphantly declare to decide the question once for all in their favor. The application of this obvious rule will, in itself, remove a whole row of difficulties with respect to the naming of other gods.

On the other hand, it is not necessary to suppose that the Hebrew writers, in denying real existence to the pagan divinities, did not recognize the presence and activity of supernatural potencies in heathen idolatry. They call these *elohim* and *elilim* also by another name, *shedim* (שְׁדִים, from שָׁד, *violenter egit, to destroy*), *destroyers, demons*. And in this they anticipated the teaching of Paul, who, while asserting that "an idol is nothing in the world," 1 Cor. 8, 4, at the same time declares that "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *demons* and not to God," 1 Cor. 10, 20. In other words, paganism is demonolatry, and the *elilim* or *elohim* are, as it were, the incar-

nations or representatives of demoniacal powers. Hence it becomes quite intelligible that the superior greatness and might of Yahveh should be contrasted with the comparative weakness of the gods of the nations, as in the above passages.

Moreover, what does this naming of other gods really amount to after all? Do we not still employ the names of heathen divinities? We do not find it irreconcilable with our belief in one God to speak of Zeus, or Apollo, or Jupiter. We speak of the God of the Jew and of the Allah of the Mahometans, and yet we know that there is only one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And just as the Biblical writers speak of the "God of the Hebrews," so do we, as Robertson says, even in our day, "speak of the God of the Christian, though we believe there is none other."¹⁾

It may, therefore, be assumed that the mention of pagan divinities by the Old Testament writers can in no wise be construed into an argument for the critical theory that in preprophetic times Yahveh was supposed to have a host of divine rivals in the field. The story of Elijah and the prophets of Baal, 1 Kings 18, is alone sufficient to overthrow this theory. Not only do Elijah's contemporaries, conscious of their guilt, receive his rebukes without a murmur or protest (v. 21: "And the people answered him not a word"), but the prophet himself, by the way in which he ridicules Baal and his worshipers, gives clear evidence that he knew that a Baal, an idol, was "nothing in the world." The conduct of Elijah becomes all the more important for our present purpose, inasmuch as it is asserted by the critics that the narratives of the patriarchs, as we possess them, were a product of this age. They must therefore be supposed to give a correct representation of the religious ideas that prevailed among the Israelites at that time. From these narratives we learn that Yahveh was to the

1) *Early Religion of Israel*, vol. II, p. 44.

patriarchs the "Most High God, the Possessor of heaven and earth," Gen. 14, 22, "the Almighty," 17, 1, "the everlasting God," 21, 33, the Controller of all nature, 49, 25, etc. Consequently, the Israelites must have believed in the exclusive Godhead of Yahveh, long before the Assyrian irruptions started the idea of "ethic monotheism" in the minds of the canonical prophets. Abraham had already given clear and concise utterance to the same truth when he said, "Shall not the Judge of all the world do right?" Gen. 18, 25, a passage assigned by the critics to the Yahvistic narrator, who is supposed to have written about 850—800 B. C.¹⁾ Consequently, if the names of other deities are mentioned, it does not imply a belief in the actual existence of these gods on the part of the writers. But this argument, if it proves anything, proves too much. For it might easily be shown that even Jeremiah believed in the reality and divinity of Chemosh, when he says, ch. 48, 7: "Chemosh shall go into captivity with his priests and princes together." And this, long after Yahveh is supposed to have been elevated to a position of exclusive and absolute deity!

There is, however, a single argument which seems to be fatal to the whole theory of a localized national deity in preprophetic times, and that is involved in the name Yahveh itself. We cannot here enter in detail upon the various derivations which have been proposed in accounting for the origin of the name. It has been traced by some scholars to an Indo-Germanic source and brought into connection with the Sanscrit root *div*, to shine, which lies at the basis of Jovis or Diovis. This same root, it is said, underlies the Hebrew tetragrammaton, which may have been pronounced Yavo, Yevo, Yove. Others have found the original home of the word in Egypt, and Yahveh is identified with the Egyptian moon-god Yoh. Stade and others trace the name

1) Driver, *Introduction*, p. 123.

to a Kenite source, and Moses is supposed to have borrowed it from the priest Jethro. Another view is that the name is to be sought for in the Canaanite language. And now that the excavated mounds of Babylon are being used by some critics as the graveyard of the Old Testament religion, the Yahveh name is said to have been derived from Babylonian sources. Friedrich Delitzsch confidently declares to have found the name on clay tablets dating from 2500 B. C.¹⁾ But he himself admits that the characters which are supposed to represent the name are very difficult to decipher ("schwer lesbare Schriftzeichen"), and, in fact, equally competent assyriologists, such as Hilprecht, deny the contention of Delitzsch altogether.

But why roam so far afield when the object of our search lies at our doorstep? We think that the Biblical account of the derivation and significance of the divine name is so exquisitely simple and adequate that it carries with it its own authentication. According to the Bible, as is well known, Yahveh is derived from the verb הה = הה , to be. In Ex. 3, 14 God gives Himself the name: Ehyeh asher Ehyeh ("I will be that I will be"; *Septuagint*: $\varepsilon\gamma\omega\ \varepsilon\mu\ \circ\ \ddot{\alpha}\nu$; *Vulgate*: *Sum, qui sum*), of which the word Yahveh is the noun formation. By its etymological signification, therefore, the name implies that Yahveh is the absolutely Existing One, the Self-existent, the eternal, uncaused, unconditioned, independent, self-sufficient, unchangeable Deity. Nor should it be overlooked that the word Yahveh is formed from the imperfect. There has been needless diversity of opinion as to whether Yahveh denoted the absolutely Existing One, or the Becoming One. Both ideas are included in the name. Jahveh does not retreat into abstract metaphysical being and stagnant quiescence like the Hindu Brahma, but reveals Himself in continuous self-manifestation, and guides the course of history according to His own

1) *Babel und Bibel*, p. 46 sq.

plan. He is, therefore, the God who enters into covenant relations with man, makes promises, and realizes them in due time. He controls all things and makes them subservient to His gracious counsels. He will always be what He will be. His designs cannot be thwarted or frustrated, but will go irrepressibly forward to their consummation. Yahveh is, therefore, the most appropriate and expressive name for the covenant God who implements His promises, who is unswervingly faithful and resistlessly powerful in accomplishing His purposes. All this is included in this pregnant name.

And now let us ask ourselves the question whether a name so rich in meaning, so broad and universal, so wide in connotation, so abstract and metaphysical, if you will, could have been invented or adopted by a number of uncultivated tribes who, according to the critical hypothesis, thought that their own little corner was the universe, and who had not yet fully stripped off the lowest forms of animistic and fetishistic worship. Thus the theory breaks down from the first. The divine name Yahveh becomes singularly inappropriate and premature, if the prophetic religion was the crude and elementary thing which it is declared to have been.

Finally, there is one aspect of this whole question—and it is the most important of all—upon which we have not yet touched. We mean the bearings of this criticism on the New Testament and the teaching of Christ. All questions relating to Biblical criticism are, in the last analyses, of intensely vital and practical concern, though the critic moves about in the Old Testament something like the antiquary in an old curiosity shop. To be sure, Driver tells us that “criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament,”¹⁾ nor does it, in his opinion, infringe upon the authority of

1) Driver, *Introduction*, Preface, p. XIII.

Jesus who in appealing to the Old Testament Scripture did not "design to pronounce a verdict on the authority and age of its different parts."¹⁾ But this matter is not to be gotten over so simply and easily. We know that Christ everywhere refers to the Old Testament as the Word of God, and to the Yahveh of the Israelites as His Father. But this Yahveh was, according to the critics, in prophetic times only a little national deity. Are we, then, to suppose that Christ professed spiritual and essential unity with this petty divinity, whose rise or fall was conditioned by the political fluctuations of a petty nationality, and who was at best only a *primus inter pares* in the form of Chemosh, Milcom, Baal and Company? *Credat Iudaeus Apella!* Or are we to suppose that Christ, either from ignorance or connivance, sanctioned the wholesale frauds and forgeries by which the earlier traditions were reconstructed into conformity with the ideas of later times? If Christ did this from ignorance, He was a self-deluded fanatic and mistaken as to His own identity; if from connivance, He compromises His moral integrity and renders Himself unworthy of our faith and homage. Such are the implications of the critical position with reference to the teaching of Christ and to Christian faith. And if "Christian" scholars, such as Driver, who leans very strongly toward the Wellhausen standpoint, experience little trouble in overcoming the difficulties involved, this is just what many others have done and still do, who strain at gnats and swallow camels. We think that, under the exigencies of logic, the stern alternative of Elijah is once more applicable: "If Yahveh be God, then follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him."

C. GAENSSLE.

1) *Ibid.*, p. XII.

THE PASTOR IN HIS WORK.

I. The Pastor a Workman.

When a man is called to the office of the Christian ministry he is not called to a life of leisure and the enjoyment of days of ease; he is called to work. The young man who chooses the ministry for his life's calling because he counts it an easy way of making a living will soon find himself sadly mistaken. Much as boys and young men should be urged to study for the ministry, especially in these days when the needs of the Church are so crying, yet they should never be promised a life of ease, because this would be using a delusive argument. The ministry is not an office for the lover of ease; it is an office connected with work, much work, hard work, responsible work, and idlers are not wanted in it. A young man should enter the ministry for the very reason that it brings work, precious work, noble work, the most useful of all work. The man who wants to work, who wants to be of the greatest possible use to his fellow men is the man wanted in the ministry. This office wants workers, and with workers of the right kind it will never be overcrowded.

St. Paul directly calls the office of the ministry a *work* when he writes: "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work," 1 Tim. 3, 1. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the *work of the ministry*," Eph. 4, 11. 12. The same is expressed in Acts 13, 2: "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." The minister of the Gospel must be a workman. This is his calling. "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" said the householder to some on the market-place, and when they said, "Because no man hath hired us," he replied, "Go ye also into the vineyard." When

God calls men into the ministry of the Gospel He calls them to work. With idlers He is not served, neither is the vineyard profited by them. The Lord's vineyard needs workmen.

Nor is the work of the ministry all of one and the same kind. It will not compare with the work of a factory hand who has only one thing to do day after day. It comprises a great variety of work. It demands mental work. Thus Paul exhorts Timothy: "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Meditate on these things; give thyself wholly to them," 1 Tim. 4, 13. 15. Besides wanting the whole mind, this office demands also bodily exertion of many kinds. Solomon experienced this, and he wrote: "Much study is a weariness of the flesh," Eccl. 12, 12. And commissioning His apostles, the Lord said: "Go ye into all the world," and this "going" is frequently harder and more dangerous work than log rolling. The ministry requires work of mind and body, hand and brain. It wants the whole man. There is scarcely another calling which requires so many and such a variety of activities as does the ministry of the Gospel. The theological professor writing his lectures by the rays of his lamp and the mountain missionary pushing his way through drifted snows are both in the work of the ministry.

And the minister must be at his work incessantly. The example of his Master is to be his pattern. Now the Master says: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," John 5, 17. Again He says: "I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day," John 9, 4. When was Jesus Christ idle? "Who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil," Acts 10, 38. The minister of the Gospel is sent to be a reaper in the Lord's harvest, John 4, 38. What farmer wants harvesters who work one hour and lie down in the shade the next? They are hired to work continuously until the sun sets. The Master wants none of the grain to spoil, He wants His barn filled, and the work must go on continually while the

harvest time lasts. Such a worker was the man who was set apart at Antioch for the work of the ministry. He worked day and night, 1 Thess. 2, 9, and neither hardship nor persecution could induce him to quit the work. This man writes: "Be followers of me, even as I also am of Christ," 1 Cor. 11, 1. And to his beloved disciple Timothy he gives this charge: "Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season. Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry," 2 Tim. 4, 2, 5. As Paul worked night and day, so is the minister of to-day to be at work night and day.

Must not the preacher have time for rest, as well as others? Indeed he must, and the Lord wants His laborers to take the needed rest. God has wisely divided the time, the day for labor, the night for rest, and man is so constituted that by rest his strength is renewed. The pastor, as well as others, should live according to God's order in nature, using the day for labor and the night for rest. Nor is it wrong for a preacher worn in mind and body to take a vacation for recuperation, agreeably to the Lord's own example. When once He was so overrun by the people that "they had no leisure so much as to eat," He said to the disciples: "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while," Mark 6, 31. The Lord wants His laborers to work, but He does not want them to overwork themselves. When Jethro saw the labors which Moses had to perform every day, he said: "Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou, and this people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone," Ex. 18, 18. And when Moses took the advice of his father-in-law and lessened the burden of his labors this was sanctioned by God Himself. The minister who overtaxes his abilities sins in ruining his health and shortening his usefulness. Taking the needed time for rest is a duty.

But needful rest must never be made a cloak for idleness. There is a marked difference between rest and idle-

ness. Rest is cessation from work for recuperation. We rest to gather new strength for more vigorous work. Idleness is simply doing nothing. Being idle is being without occupation. We are here not speaking of squandering time *cum allotriis*, but of idleness in the literal sense. Neither should it be counted entirely needless to warn against idleness among pastors. While it is true that most pastors, especially in our American Lutheran church, are so overburdened that absolutely no time remains for them to be idle, there are some so situated that they *can* idle away days and weeks, and this becomes a source of temptation to many a pastor. The flesh is naturally inclined to idleness. It loves ease, and the old Adam is a veritable genius in the art of inventing excuses for doing nothing. One such excuse is, When a pastor has performed those duties which are specified in the call handed him by the congregation he has done his work and can take his ease. He conducts public worship, he visits the sick as often as it needs must be, he instructs the catechumens more or less thoroughly, and what more has he to do? Instead of regarding the duties named in the call a short outline of his work, which in fact they generally are, particularly when the call was issued by new and untrained congregations, the idle pastor is prone to restrict his work to the very letter of his *diploma vocationis*. The pastor who yields himself to the natural love of ease becomes blind to all opportunities, so that he can find nothing to do. He might, perhaps, do mission work, but he can see no opening, and he has not the enterprise to seek an opening. He might do fireside preaching from house to house, but he is called only to preach from the pulpit. He might handle the pen, but he is too indolent to recognize the gift that is in him. When the common man says, "Preachers have nothing to do," that is but too true of many a preacher. He might have his hands full, and more than full, but—he has nothing to do.

"Woe to them that are at ease in Zion!" Amos 6,1. This woe is sure to come on the lazy pastor. He will soon lose the respect of his congregation. People will begin to call him "a doless man," and before long they will speak of "that lazy fellow," and if, after idling away a year or two at one place, he must undergo the labor of moving to another it serves him right. The idler in the ministry is a nuisance to the vineyard, an eyesore to the Lord, and his reward will be small.

The very nature of this sacred office requires industrious, persistent work. The minister is the Lord's steward, appointed to distribute his Master's goods, 1 Cor. 4, 1, and to him is the word of the Lord: "Thou therefore gird up thy loins, and arise, and speak unto them all that I command thee," Jer. 1, 17. The steward must be at his work distributing his Master's goods. This is the Master's expectation. For this purpose He has provided the goods, and great is the stock which He has provided and great the multitude of those to whom He wants the goods divided out. Art thou a steward in the kingdom of Jesus Christ? Be at thy work distributing the store, lest thy Master find thee idle and say: Why are my goods left to lie idle in the storehouse? Thou slothful servant! Seest thou not those sleepers yonder? Why is not the trumpet of Sinai sounded into their ears to awaken them? Hast thou no eye for those famishing souls? Why are they not fed with the bread which I have provided and placed at thy disposal? Where are those dwellers in the alleys and those hiders behind the hedges hard by thy steward's dwelling, and why have they never been invited to my supper? If the military steward must be at it three times a day, the steward of the Lord must be at it night and day that he miss not an opportunity to dispose of his Master's goods.

Neither must the steward of the Lord measure his work by the pay which he receives from men. Alas, that so many congregations pay their pastor a salary which is just enough

to keep him from starving. Congregations that pay their pastor a paltry few hundred when they would well be able to double it should consider that they are throwing a stumbling block in his way. When a certain pastor was exhorted by some of his members to preach better sermons, seeing he was well able to do it, he replied: "Poor pay, poor preach," and probably smitten by their own conscience those exhorters became silent. When penury stares the pastor in the face he may easily be tempted to do little because his pay is so little. But is it right to proportion the work done for the Chief Shepherd to the emolument received from the flock? The pastor who will measure his work by his pay becomes a hireling. He looks to his own, and not to the things which are Jesus Christ's, Phil. 2, 21. The man who is in the ministry from the love of Jesus for the winning of souls should ever be ready to do his best, let the salary received be large or small. And when it is sometimes difficult for us pastors to make ends meet we should remember that the Lord Himself also became poor for our sakes, that we through His poverty might be rich, 2.Cor. 8, 9.

Pay small, pay large. Thou steward of the Lord, be at thy work. There is a nobility in it. What nobler work under the sun than the winning of souls for the mansions in the skies? The world indeed has small honor for the hard-working steward of Christ. The world knows not the true standard by which the value of his labor must be taxed. It knows only earthly values and taxes only by earthly gain. In a measure the world does give honor to the stewards of Christ. A railroad company composed of infidel stockholders may grant reduced fare to clergymen in consideration that their work contributes to the safety of property or the extension of traffic, but for the true, inward work of the Gospel ministry the world has no valuation. The Gospel is foolishness to the world, and what is the winning of souls for Christ to the wise of this world but hallucination? And

the more zealously a minister is given to the wooing of souls for the heavenly Bridegroom the less honor will he find with the world. "We are made as the filth of the earth," says the apostle, "and are the offscouring of all things unto this day," 1 Cor. 4, 13. But over whom will the angels of heaven have greater joy? Over the millionaire organizing millionaire trusts for the gaining of millions, or over the missionary founding churches in waste places? There is a nobility in the Christian ministry, a nobility exceeding that of the house of Amala, a nobility bestowed on it by the King of kings. The work of the ministry is not like the work of the streetsweep the traces of which are wiped out in a day. "I have chosen you, and ordained you," says the Lord, "that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain," John 15, 16. What a glorious day when the hard-worked reaper can present his sheaf at the door of the everlasting barns and can say to the Doorkeeper: In great mercy didst Thou make me a reaper in Thy harvest, and here is the sheaf which I have reaped.

Fellow reaper, have you the blues? Are you acquainted with days of discouragement and despondency? So am I. But let me tell you that you are sinning against your Master. Yielding to despondency is a transgression of the First Commandment, and it is a wrong done to yourself and the Church. It makes the workman like a bird with broken wings, dampens the ardor and hampers the work. In the gloom of discouragement you say, "I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for naught, and in vain." Shake it off as did the Lord who spoke these words by the mouth of the prophet, and rather say, "Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God," Is. 49, 4. And what is the judgment of the Lord? "I know thy works, and thy labor, and thy patience, and how thou hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored, and hast not fainted," Rev. 2, 2. 3. Your heart is drooping because you can see so little fruit

of your work? Learn to walk by faith. That is a very important lesson for your own soul's salvation. Do you feel disappointed, because your work finds little or no recognition with men? Are you thirsting after the praise spoken of by the Lord when He says: "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets," Luke 6, 26? Or would you do your own crowning? Remember, it is the Lord who has hired you. You do the work, let Him do the crowning; that is the right division. You are not discouraged, but you are tired, because the years are many and the harness sits hard on the bending shoulders. Lift up thy head, thou father in Israel, and step on lustily. The end is in sight and the reward is coming. Soon the words spoken to aged Daniel, in a sense, will apply unto thee: "Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days," Dan. 12, 13.

Unfaltering perseverance in the work is the more necessary because of that roaring lion who goeth about seeking whom he may devour. There is no man more hateful to Satan than the steward of the Lord who is busily portioning out the right kind of rations. Walking up and down in the earth the evil foe finds little satisfaction in his wide domain. He is mortified at that man Job, and he sharpens his wits to fell him and to destroy the fruit of his labors. When the pastor who has labored long at last yields to the spirit of ease he gives opportunity for the enemy to sow his tares, and may at last lose his labor. The hand once put to the plow, the watchword must be to drive on and on until the evening is come. When you have plowed the acre apportioned you the Master will unharness you, and the souls saved by the instrumentality of your labor shall stand with you in the presence of the Lord. "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, inasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord," 1 Cor. 15, 58. VIRGINIUS.

LUTHERANISM AND AMERICANISM.

We Lutherans annually celebrate the festival of the Reformation. It is right and meet that we do so, for we are children of the Reformation. We are Lutherans, and we both should and would publicly confess it. Nowhere are we ashamed of this name, for it denotes something great, yea, the greatest thing in the world. The crown of a king is a mere pittance by comparison. And, if asked what constitutes the greatness of Lutheranism, we reply: The liberty, the spiritual liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free, Gal. 5, 1, which the Son of God purchased for us with His blood and which He declares and offers to us in the Gospel.

This spiritual liberty is something wonderfully great and glorious. It consists in freedom from sin, its guilt as well as punishment; for Christ was made to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. It consists in freedom from an evil conscience, which has been silenced by the remission of sins in the blood of Christ. It is freedom from all demands and threats of the Law, since Christ fulfilled the Law for us. It is freedom from the devil, the cruel tyrant, who frightens us with the terrors of death and the torments of hell; for Christ has bruised the head of Satan, has taken the sting out of death, and wrested the victory from hell. It is freedom, also, from all the commandments of men and statutes of the Church, freedom from all tyrants, pope and bishop and priest, who make God's grace and eternal salvation dependent upon obedience to their demands.

This wonderful liberty which makes of a slave of Satan a blissful child of God constitutes the greatness of Lutheranism. True, it was not Luther but Christ, and Christ alone, that acquired this liberty for us. But the pope had robbed the Christians of it, and Luther gave it back to them. Through Luther's services we, too, have acquired

possession of this liberty. Before the Reformation Christendom languished in the bonds of Antichrist and of his tools. The pope had defrauded the church of the Gospel, of salvation solely by faith in Christ. He had led Christendom back into its former thrall—of sin, the Law, the devil, death, and hell. The children of God the Antichrist had made the slaves of himself and Satan. The pope with his hierarchy had forced himself in between Christ and the Christians. Without his laws and statutes, yea, without his abominations and idolatries he would suffer no man to be saved. Then came the Angel of the Reformation with the everlasting Gospel and the declaration of Christian liberty, and millions were blessed with this, the greatest of all blessings. It is the possession of this liberty that makes a man a Lutheran.

We are Lutherans. But we are also Americans. Proceeding from Saxony, the Reformation first spread through Germany. The first spiritually free Lutherans were Germans. We are Americans, Americans of German, Scandinavian, and English tongues, respectively. Nor is *this* a thing we deplore or feel as a defect. Nowhere in the wide world are we ashamed, or need we be ashamed, that we are Americans. For with this name, again, we designate a blessing for which we owe a special debt of gratitude to God. And if asked what constitutes the distinguishing feature of Americanism, we point to the glorious liberty enjoyed in America in things political as well as religious.

A great deal has been said and written about Americanism and the American spirit. The sects deem it their special allotted task to "Americanize" the "foreigners" and "aliens." And when asked wherein the "Americanism" consists to which they would win over the "foreigners" and "aliens," they name, as its all-important ingredients, Sabbath observance and abstinence. In their view these are the fundamental articles of Christianity and Americanism alike. Also Archbishop Ireland and other

Roman Catholic dignitaries parade themselves on every possible occasion as the very embodiment of Americanism and are loud in singing its praises. But as Puritanism, imported from Great Britain, is the sectarian, so the Roman Catholic conception of Americanism is popery pure and simple: the very opposite of true Americanism.

The real essence of Americanism is the liberty which our country grants to every one of its citizens: personal, political, national, and, above all, religious liberty. In our country the citizens are not encumbered with many unnecessary and superfluous laws. Absolute personal liberty, indeed, exists nowhere, not even in America. But what the American citizen does enjoy is a measure of personal liberty such as can be found in no other part of the world. Then there is our political liberty. The American people are not, as is the case in many other countries, divided into two classes: rulers and subjects, the former being above, the latter under the law. Our president is no less subject to the law than is the most humble citizen. In America, moreover, the people are not vested with the mere honor of obeying; they frame and administer the laws. All citizens have equal rights and duties, and the votes of the poor and humble count just as much as the ballots of the rich and eminent. Universal political liberty and equality is an important part of the content of Americanism. The same is true of our national liberty, which consists in our nation's independence of other world powers. We are not subject, as, for example, the Boers now are, to British decrees. Ours is a sovereign land with respect to all foreign powers. And this our national liberty and independence, for which our fathers struggled and bled, we regard as a great and noble blessing, without which all other American liberties could not stand.

The most precious jewel, however, in Americanism, is its religious liberty. In Turkey, in Russia, and in many Catholic countries, intolerance and religious persecution

rule supreme. In Spain and Italy Protestantism is tolerated as one will suffer an evil which he cannot uproot. Germany, England, and Canada enjoy religious liberty, but not religious equality. The state church is the established and privileged religion: in Prussia the United, in England the Episcopal Church; and in Quebec and Ontario the Catholic Church is the most favored religion. Not so in the United States. Here every man may serve his God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and all religions and churches are on a basis of perfect equality before the law. Here the Jew has the same rights as the Christian, and the Protestant enjoys no prerogatives as compared with the Catholic, nor does the largest religious body as compared with the smallest. In America Church and State are completely separated. In our federal constitution and in the constitutions and statutes of the several states no church organization enjoys any special privileges. The complete separation of Church and State and the consequent religious liberty and equality of all religions and denominations is not a mere characteristic of Americanism but its very essence: the innermost soul and life of the American spirit. He that impugns and curtails this liberty attacks the heart of Americanism. And if Catholics or Puritans should ever succeed in getting this liberty eliminated, Americanism itself would thereby be destroyed.

Lutheranism and Americanism—both are great, and the greatness in both is liberty. Yet the two are not the same. Each differs from the other *toto genere*. Lutheranism is concerned about man's proper relation to God, while Americanism is concerned about the citizen's place in the commonwealth and his relation to the government. Thus the two are wholly diverse. And for this very reason they never conflict. Lutheranism does not set aside Americanism, and Americanism does not preclude Lutheranism nor any of its parts. If Luther were to appear in St. Louis, he could cheerfully and without violating his conscience

become an American citizen. He could swear to uphold the American liberties without surrendering one jot or tittle of his Lutheranism. Even in its final consequences Lutheranism does not conflict with Americanism. And whenever a consistent American desires to become a Lutheran he is not required to sacrifice one particle of his Americanism. Consistent Lutheranism and consistent Americanism are never and nowhere at variance.¹⁾

It is wrong, therefore, to suppose that a Lutheran, in order to become a full-fledged American, must adapt himself more or less to the ways of the sects, as even many Lutherans still seem to think. The truth is, that there is a glaring contrast between the Puritan and the American spirit. As popery is the opposite of Americanism, because it breeds a priest-ridden people of bondsmen, so also in Calvinism, Zwinglianism, Episcopalianism, and Presbyterianism there are elements which, if consistently carried out, are destructive of the very essence of American liberty. A Calvinist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Reformedist, must suspend some of his religious tenets when he becomes an American citizen. For all these denominations teach and confess in their creeds that it is the sacred duty of the State to provide for the establishment of the right religion and for the rooting out of heresy. This error, firmly rooted, as it is, in the very principles of the papacy and sectarianism, is a standing menace to the American spirit of our Catholic and sectarian fellow citizens. And in many of them the spirit of popery and Puritanism has already vanquished the spirit of Americanism. This is evidenced on the one hand by the constant efforts of the papists to introduce their religion into the public schools, and to obtain public endowments for their Catholic schools and institutions; and on the other hand by the enmity of

1) See THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, vol. VI, p. 148 ff., on the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines respecting religious liberty and the relation of state and church.

the sects against parochial schools and by their untiring zeal to introduce the Bible and religious instruction into the public schools. While thus Americanism and consistent sectarianism are utterly incompatible with each other Lutheranism and Americanism dwell in perfect harmony, and, other things being equal, a Lutheran makes the best American: the consistent representative of American liberty.

True, the liberty to ravage and ruin, to murder and slay, and to commit other abominable deeds and acts of violence, for which the peasants, for instance, were banded together in 1525,—the liberty to avenge one's self and take the law into one's own hands, which is encouraged by the anarchists, Socialists, and lynchers, and which unions frequently resort to,—the liberty to oppress the laboring classes and the poor, claimed and practiced by many trusts and employers,—the liberty to do violence, especially religious violence, which the papists thirst after, in order to drive the Protestants back into the fold of the Catholic church,—the liberty of the fanatics who seek, with the aid of the government, to coerce their fellow citizens into Sabbath observance and abstinence, who strive to inculcate in the public schools their religious teachings and hymns upon Catholics and Jews, and who attempt to force Lutheran children out of Christian schools into the public schools,—*this* liberty, where a citizen arrogates to himself the right to do violence to his fellow citizens and to rob them of their liberties, is a shameful abuse of liberty, yea, bald tyranny, and absolutely incompatible with both Lutheran and American liberty. He that uses this liberty to oppress and to do violence forfeits his spiritual liberty, which will not serve as a cloak for maliciousness. And to all that is truly great in Americanism the growing tendency to indulge in this spurious liberty is likewise a standing menace.

Americanism and Lutheranism are not at variance with each other. Americanism does, however, bear a certain relation of dependency to Lutheranism, though the reverse

cannot be said. Lutheranism with its spiritual liberty is not dependent upon Americanism with its temporal liberty. Genuine Lutheranism existed prior to Americanism. Lutheranism is conditioned neither positively nor negatively by personal, political, national, or even religious liberty. Lutheranism can exist and survive in a country where it is granted neither equality nor liberty nor tolerance. As Christianity flourished in the first three centuries of imperial Roman intolerance, so also Lutheranism thrrove and spread in the sixteenth and seventeenth century of papal Roman persecution, in spite of ban and interdict, in spite of the Inquisition with its dungeons and pyres. Papists could deprive Lutherans of their property and lives, of their children and wives, but the great treasure of Lutheranism, the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, was beyond the reach of the executioner's ax and torch. While we cheerfully admit that the unqualified religious liberty and equality which Lutheranism enjoys in America, and which is not granted it even in Germany, the cradle of Lutheranism, is conducive to a healthy unfolding of Lutheran doctrine and practice, still true Lutheranism with its spiritual liberty is not dependent upon Americanism with its secular liberty.

On the other hand, however, Americanism is hardly conceivable without Lutheranism. Without the Lutheran Reformation there would be an America, indeed, but no free America. Without Luther the pope would still be in full possession of his spiritual and temporal power, of which religious intolerance is an essential part. When Luther appeared there was not in all the wide world a single spot where unqualified religious liberty prevailed, and in all Christendom there was not a single theologian that espoused the cause of universal religious liberty. The Catholic theologians taught then, as they do to this day, that civil government is the servant of the Church to silence heretics and burn them. Nor could Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, John Knox, and other Reformed theologians give to Amer-

ica religious liberty. For they all taught and confessed in their creeds that it is the duty of governments to provide for the establishment of the true, and the rooting out of false, religion. The ideal cherished by the Reformed and Calvinistic theologians was not complete separation of Church and State, combined with universal religious liberty and equality, but the amalgamation of Church and State into state churches or church states, coupled with the oppression and extermination of false teachers. Hereof bear witness the earliest communities, established in America by Puritans, Episcopalians, and the Dutch Reformed, in which Quakers, Baptists, Catholics, and Lutherans were oppressed and cruelly persecuted. Luther stands alone and without a parallel as the prophet not only of spiritual liberty, but of religious liberty as well. Complete separation of Church and State, combined with universal religious liberty as we enjoy it in America, was an ideal which was not realized in Luther's day, but which Luther clung to unto the very last.

Yea, without the spiritual liberty, possessed and proclaimed by Lutherans, secular liberty cannot be fully enjoyed. Spiritual bondage inevitably leads to temporal bondage. And the liberty which our country affords is neither a cure of, nor a safe-guard against, spiritual bondage. Thousands of papists come to America, rejoice in the liberty which they breathe, and yet remain a priest-ridden people. And when the Irish and Poles, tired of tyranny, outwardly break away from Rome, even then they remain inwardly and spiritually bound. In their consciences pope and priest still sit enthroned, and the only thing that can dethrone them is—not Americanism—but the Gospel of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, the Alpha and Omega of Lutheranism. Priests lord it over their flocks in free America as they do in Italy and Spain. And this renders the full enjoyment of American liberty a thing unattainable to Catholics. The priest will dictate to them what meas-

ures and men they shall vote for, and what they shall do and what not, in matters which the laws of God and the state leave to their own free choice. Even in purely external affairs these sons of bondage remain the slaves of Rome in the midst of free America. And in as far as the Puritan sects are spiritually unfree and regard themselves as still bound by the law of Moses, they, too, come short of the full enjoyment of that liberty which our country would give to them also. Full enjoyment of American liberty is attainable only to him whom Christ has freed, freed also from all commandments of men.

Hence, when we Lutherans stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and suffer neither papists nor Puritans to entangle us in the yoke of bondage; and when we, out of gratitude to God, are bent on winning over our fellow citizens to the Lutheran liberty, which is fairer and grander than everything else in the world: we at the same time establish and strengthen what is great in Americanism—personal, political, national, and religious liberty.

Theological Review.

Experimental Religion. The Experiences of Christophorus from his Awakening to his Falling Asleep in Jesus. By F. K.: VIRGINIUS. 198 pages. Augusta Publishing Co., Crimora, Va. Price, 75 cents.

According to this allegory Christopher, a young man of the world, happens into a country church, where he is stirred up to a sense of his guilt. In the metropolis he is invited to sinful pleasures, but he declines and begins to read the Bible. He falls in with Rev. Legal and is taught to rid himself of sin by keeping the law; but he finds no peace. His heart is tormented with fears, doubts, and despair, until he hears an Easter sermon on justification by V., the pastor of the country church. Joy and peace enter his heart. His father, however, declares him an enthusiast, and revivalists call him a dead

formalist. But by the Bible and the witness of the Spirit he is convinced of the genuineness of his conversion, which he proves by works of love. On an ocean voyage, however, he falls in with seductive company, and in a metropolis of Spanish America he lives like the Prodigal. On his way home he repents, and henceforth he proves himself an humble and faithful Christian in performing his various duties, as well as in resisting and overcoming great temptations.—Evidently the object of this allegory is to show that genuine religious experience is the effect of pure religious teaching. Dogmatic and experimental religion go together. The latter does not and cannot exist without the former. Religious experiences that cannot be traced to Bible truths as their effective causes are heathen delusions. Religious emotions and feelings flowing from human opinions and false religious teachings are mere hallucinations (a species of insanity), "ein selbstgemachter Wahn vom Glauben," as Luther says. Real religious experiences presuppose real religious truths as their sufficient causes. What is neither true nor real cannot, properly speaking, be *experienced*. Therefore, since the pure doctrines of Christianity, as taught by the Lutheran confessions, are the *only true* doctrines, they, and they alone, are productive of genuine and real Christian experience. Modern theologians and revivalists who despise dogmatic, and prate experimental Christianity may produce what psychology calls "religious emotions," but genuine Christian experience, *i. e.*, real, sound, and sane religious experience—never. Experimental Christianity is the effect of dogmatic Christianity. For the title, "Experimental Religion," the author could have substituted, "Dogmatic Religion." In his allegory he exemplifies the effects of the Law and Gospel on a sinner, and shows that Christian experience is true faith: the divine assurance of the Gospel truth: Your sins are forgiven you for Jesus' sake. And this new light in a terror-stricken soul is, indeed, the very essence and source of all genuine religious experience. Regarding the preaching of the Law and the Gospel the *Apology* says: "It truly *penetrates* into the heart, strikes the conscience with *alarm*, and is not a jest, but great *terror*, in which the soul *feels* its wretchedness and sins, and the wrath of God. While in this terror, the heart should again seek *consolation*, which takes place when we *believe* in the promise of Christ, that, through Him, we receive remission of sin. The faith, which, in such fear and terror, *cheers* the heart and consoles it, receives and *experiences* (*empfaehet* und *empfindet*) remission of sin, justifies us and brings life; for this strong *consolation* is a new birth and a new life."

F. B.